A U M

A river, like Truth, will flow on forever and have no end. —CONFUCIUS

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXV June, 1947 No. 8

"THE WHOLE CURRENT"

THEOSOPHY, unlike science, religion and philosophy, is not a form of knowledge: its teachers have defined it as a *body* of knowledge. But since no man's knowledge can be transferred to another, Theosophy is presented in a series of propositions. The propositions need to be proved by the individual who seeks the knowledge—they have already been proved by those who preserve the knowledge and who periodically call it to the attention of mankind.

Conviction about the truth of Theosophy is, therefore, of two kinds—conviction that Theosophy will prove to be true, and conviction that Theosophy is true. The first conviction is that of students of Theosophy; the second, of its Knowers. To confuse the first conviction with the second is to make Theosophy a religion, a doctrine calling for belief only. Its knowers then become merely the greatest believers, the most inflexible theorists. This confusion is inevitable, if the problem is intellectually considered. The intellect knows only what it knows. It is for the imagination or the intuition to reach for what is only dimly glimpsed, to move with confidence toward that which is not yet understood. Our language has a precise term for the activity of these higher faculties of mind: they *divine* truth, they "perceive through sympathy" where the analytical mind sees nothing; they generate understanding for concepts presently beyond reason.

As far as the individual is concerned, the difference between knowledge and belief is the difference between truth and an attitude of mind toward truth. He who would discover the truth about man and nature must first convince himself that there is such a truth to be found: this is the abandonment of agnosticism. Then he must be certain that he himself can know truth: this is the abandonment of religion. Finally, he must be strong enough

to accept an hypothesis without "believing" it, until he can prove it without prejudice: this is the beginning of conviction. He must be willing to pursue his search beyond each hard-won plateau of enlightenment, else conviction will turn in upon itself and create dogmatism. Then a "religion" will again crystallize around his mind, holding it hard and fast to a formulation. The bondage has an end, the mold breaks—but the mind, by force of reaction, swings again into agnosticism and there remains, until the impulse to know is reawakened within.

Conviction is the balance-point between learning and believing. True conviction is a belief that has been learned; it stimulates the mind to further learning. Dogmatism or imperfect conviction applies to that which should have been learned, but is only believed; dogmatism sustains religions, although it moves the mind to ever more unstable beliefs.

It would not be surprising, in view of the tremendous weight of dogmatic religious skandhas in the West, if the present theosophical movement had bogged down completely in mutually exclusive swamps of sectarianism. The teachings brought in 1875 by H. P. Blavatsky, and widely promulgated in the next quarter century, do not exist in our day simply because a handful of books and a few hundred magazine articles have been kept in circulation. Nor because, from H.P.B.'s day down to the present, a succession of writers have published their understanding of one or all of the theosophical tenets, and several generations of speakers have talked about Theosophy. The ordinary tactics of propaganda will keep any idea in currency, whether it is true or false, and whether it is designed to liberate or enslave the human mind. But keeping truths *alive* is another matter entirely.

For reasons which were scarcely appreciated at the time, and which are not widely admitted even by present-day theosophists, H. P. Blavatsky, in discussing the promulgation of Theosophy, singled out the work of William Q. Judge, her American colleague, for special mention. Mr. Judge was not a colorful personality, nor a brilliant orator, and although he wrote incessantly—articles, letters, answers to questions and several newspaper series—he had a queer habit of signing, instead of his name, one or another of a number of pseudonyms. He was, in short, hardly a candidate for a Theosophical propaganda chief. Yet H.P.B. showed, and an examination of subsequent theosophical history will substantiate her observation, that Mr. Judge's influence did far more

to spread Theosophy broadcast than the efforts of any other individual. She declared in 1888, and in her last days re-asserted, that to him "chiefly, if not entirely" did Theosophy in America owe its *life*.

What was the influence of Wm. Q. Judge? Whence came his power to keep theosophical ideas alive? What, in his relation to Theosophy, distinguished him from other sincere members of the Theosophical Society? In simplest terms, the answer is that he was, first, last and all the time, a *student* of Theosophy. He was not advertising an interpretation of Theosophy; his characteristic and constant direction to all who inquired of him was, study *Theosophy*. In answering questions his practice was to state the theosophical position, and also to warn the questioner not to adopt the view presented without himself ascertaining, by reference to the theosophical literature, that the position outlined did in fact square with the philosophy.

Mr. Judge's promulgation of Theosophy had another overtone: practical application of the doctrines. But he insisted that no personal applications be accounted ends in themselves. Application, as he conceived it, meant *universal* application; it meant a persistent endeavor to make a fresh analysis, to find a wider meaning, to achieve a more impersonal understanding. The direction of one's application was also important: application to others, he held, was unnecessary as well as dangerous, for it led to self-righteousness, besides generating resistance and resentment in those criticized. Application to oneself, he pointed out, should inspire self-correction, a pruning of personal traits that obscure and retard growth of character.

Because Mr. Judge held himself to be a student of Theosophy, he ever stood ready to alter course and conduct as soon as he perceived a better application of the principles he followed, totally subordinating the personal element in himself. The energy thus converted enabled him to wield the one influence indispensable to theosophical promulgation: Unity. He knew the science of numbers as it relates to human undertakings. The force of numbers is a function simply of their sum, and increases arithmetically. The *power* of numbers involves an inner cohesion and increases geometrically if unity is preserved. The work of Theosophy requires self-reliant individuals, but the work of each one is multiplied in power just to the degree that he can work with others for a common aim.

Mr. Judge kept Theosophy alive because he gave it his life—with no sentimental flourish, no fervent histrionics and ostentatious martyrdom. He gave the energy of his heart and mind, not to a cold Abstraction devoid of all human warmth, but to his fellow men, in generous sympathy and complete charity. What he gave was his *daily* living in thought and deed. He was no believer in religious Theosophy: he believed in study of Theosophy, work for Theosophy, and unity on the basis of Theosophy.

Theosophy had its Recorder, but her exemplification of the philosophy, if it had been left to stand alone and unduplicated, would have meant nothing more to a religion-making world than that H.P.B. was another prophet who had faith in her own revelation. Theosophy needed an Exemplifier who could not be dismissed as merely a follower: W.Q.J.'s life brought independent testimony to the value of its doctrines as a standard of living. But an exception cannot prove the rule unless the rule is known: it was Robert Crosbie who deduced the rule to prove the exception. H. P. Blavatsky gave the Key to Theosophy; and Wm. Q. Judge the Key to *theosophists;* it remained for Mr. Crosbie to turn both keys, and to put them in the hands of as many others as desired to use them.

Mr. Crosbie is thus primarily responsible for restoring Mr. Judge, in the understanding of a growing number of theosophists, to the position accorded him by H.P.B.; and likewise for maintaining, in the case of H.P.B., the position accorded her by Masters. This was not done out of a desire to glorify individuals, but in recognition of the fact that if Theosophy is to survive as a leaven of brotherhood in the race mind, it must not be allowed to degenerate into a set of dogmas built up by Authority. The only safeguard is individual and direct study of the teachings themselves, and the only safe teachers are those who never demand belief nor accept personal acclaim, but who are teachers of *Theosophy.*

This was the end in view when Mr. Crosbie established the United Lodge of Theosophists in 1909. The title, as well as the U.L.T. Declaration, came from Mr. Judge's words, for R.C., having experienced at first hand the power of unadulterated Theosophy, had a sense of discrimination trained in impersonality and had developed the ability to follow a *line of work* without following a leader. He knew how to *build* on tradition, consulting the past with its proven principles as he consulted his contemporaries,

fearing no suggestion, ready to consider any well-intentioned proposal. The method of conference—of "bringing together"—was natural to one who strove for unity above differences, and for solidarity as the dynamic basis of all individual efforts.

Of Mr. Judge, R.C. afterwards wrote, "My first meeting with him changed the whole current of my life." Of the "friendly philosopher" himself it may be said that that "whole current" flowed into and flows out through the present theosophical movement. He never desired place nor position in the eyes of men, but he made and retains his own place in the Brotherhood of Humanity.

"The Future Man"

A new era has begun in literature, this is certain. New thoughts and new interests have created new intellectual needs; hence a new race of authors is springing up. It is not he who repeats obstinately and parrot-like the old literary formulae who will find himself answering to the new needs; not the man who prefers his narrow party discipline to the search for the long-exiled Spirit of man and the now lost Truths; not these, but verily he who, parting company with his beloved "authority," lifts boldly and carries on unflinchingly the standard of the *Future Man*. It is finally those who, amidst the present wholesale dominion of the worship of matter, material interests and Selfishness, will have bravely fought for human rights and *man's divine nature*, who will become, if they only win, the teachers of the masses in the coming century, and so their benefactors.

They will have learnt to express and put into practice the aspirations as well as the physical needs of the rising generations and of the now trampled-down masses. In order that one should fully comprehend *individual* life with its physiological, psychic and spiritual mysteries, he has to devote himself with all the fervour of unselfish philanthropy and love for his brother men, to studying and knowing *collective* life, or Mankind. Without preconceptions or prejudice, as also without the least fear of possible results in one or another direction, he has to decipher, understand and *remember* the deep and innermost feelings and the aspirations of the poor people's great and suffering heart. To do this he has first "to attune his soul with that of Humanity," as the old philosophy teaches; to thoroughly master the correct meaning of every line and word in the rapidly turning pages of the Book of Life of Mankind and to be thoroughly saturated with the truism that the latter is a whole inseparable from his own Self. —H.P.B.

THEOSOPHY AND ASCETICISM

WHAT is the greatest delusion and what causes it? Always one thing—relative truth. Its cause is ignorance. There never was a religion, there never was a philosophy, that did not embody relative truth. It is this relative truth which confuses mankind. Men do not see that Truth is *one;* that truth agrees only with truth; that error disagrees with truth and disagrees with error.

Relative truth is the cause of man's becoming involved in a partial view of the universe and of himself. Each man tries to *segregate* truth by looking only in some given direction. He thinks all is right on this side, all wrong on that. Thus each one makes his own limitations. As a man thinks, he becomes. If he thinks he is a poor miserable sinner, he certainly will not step beyond the limitation thus self-imposed, until he changes his fundamental ideas. We are always acting upon and affecting each other in thought and action. So we get a consensus of ideas, and that consensus forms the general impression and the general limitation of the individual, of a class of men, of mankind generally—the barrier that each has to overcome for himself if he is ever to get beyond personal or racial limitations.

Soul means experience. Our "soul" is all the experience we have gained that has brought us to our present status. What governs the man, and what governs mankind generally, is the idea and ideas held as to what life is and what the nature of man is —ideas differing at different times and among different peoples. We at the present time have ours. Our personal life, our social life, our civilization, have all arisen from the ideas we hold in regard to life. The real question should be with each one of us, are those ideas true? Do they cover the whole ground? Are they susceptible of improvement? Have the results obtained through them been all that we could wish? What are our ideas of God, of Nature, of Man?

The religion we have nominally adopted has proved a failure. It has not changed human nature in any degree. The good by nature are good under this or any other religion. The "bad" by nature are bad, whether under our own or any other religion. It is from our basis and habits of thought that our actions flow; if we have a true basis of thought, then we will certainly have right actions and practices.

NOTE.—This is a stenographic report of a talk by Robert Crosbie.—Eds.

Theosophy is not a religion, not a formula or dogma invented by man, but is, as a matter of fact, a statement of the Laws which govern the intellectual, the psychical, astral and physical constituents of man and of nature. It does not depend upon revelation or authority, but upon its inherent truth and the fact that its truth can be verified by every man for himself. The whole cry of Theosophy is to arouse man to an understanding of his own illimitable nature, so that he may know the action that is necessary for him to proceed along the truest and highest lines.

What has all this to do with Asceticism? Everything. Buddha was an ascetic. Jesus was an ascetic. So were the Founders of every great religion or philosophy. We do not hear from them insistence on this kind of food, or that kind of food, this kind of practice or that. From one and all of them we have these essential statements: Love one another; forgive your enemies; do good to them that despitefully use you and persecute you.

Again, do you think that William Q. Judge and H. P. Blavatsky were ascetics, and if so, of what kind? They were ascetics in the truest sense. They never made any pretensions in their actions. They never said, "Copy me." They always said, "Do not follow me nor my path; follow the path I show, the Masters who are behind." They had all the power which comes from true asceticism, not through refraining from nor denying anything or anybody, but by the acceptance of all, the use of all.

Everything in great nature of whatever kind has been produced by the beings in the world, and is a natural evolution—everything. Where we have erred is in the improper use, the abuse of the very powers which we all possess. The most sacred of all our powers have been sacrificed on the altar of selfishness. The true ascetic knows that. He knows that men have digged a pit for themselves by the very power of the Spirit which they are, and that no one above us—however high— can remove men from the ditch they have digged, but themselves.

Everyone has some idea as to what asceticism means. We know that monks and nuns have segregated themselves, withdrawn from the world and all participation in its affairs; for centuries that was considered to be asceticism, and still is by many people. Some have thought that asceticism consists in renouncing very many things that are used in the world. Some imagine that the eating of unaccustomed food is going to produce a spiritual ef-

fect; that through this relinquishment they are going to attain some spiritual advantage. The same is true with regard to many other practices.

Might we not well consider the motive of such practices? If one brought up in a certain way, accustomed to certain things, renounces them with the idea that thereby he is going to benefit by that relinquishment, there must be behind that intention and practice a selfish, personal desire. That selfish, personal desire could not by any possibility bring one to a state of enlightenment, regardless of what the practice might consist in.

If it be food we are thinking of, if we imagine that we will benefit spiritually by eating this and by not eating that, then food is all that we are thinking of. That is not high thinking, and the mere fact of thinking of one kind of food in preference to another can not lead to any development whatever. There are those who consider that a vegetarian diet, or a diet of nuts, cereals, or some other thing, rather than flesh, will be beneficial to them—always to *them*. They forget that there are many peoples, the Hindus, for instance, who do not eat flesh at all; yet it cannot be said that the mass of Hindus are in any way spiritual in their development, or great factors in the advancement of true civilization. We might consider also that animals—many of them—are very strict vegetarians; yet they are not especially spiritual.

It has many times been stated that true asceticism does not consist in the eating or non-eating of any kind of food whatever, nor in any practice whatever, nor in any posture whatever, but consists solely of *an attitude of mind*. Jesus said, "To the pure all things are pure"—an occult statement which has been many times repeated. So if we are to consider asceticism, we must look along other lines than those which have, unfortunately, been so generally accepted by people looking for knowledge.

The object of existence is to gain knowledge. The fact of existence as we find it, and our ideas as to what constitutes truth, have been brought about under law, by ourselves. Each one finds himself in that place, mentally as well as physically, which he has prepared for himself as a result of what he has thought and done in the past, in this and other lives. Our present and our future are also under law. Our present is mitigated, and the future may be entirely changed and corrected, by a right attitude toward all things, asceticism included, and then by the right

and full performance of duty—true asceticism—in the light of the perception of universal Truth.

A true ascetic is one who cares not whether he eats or does not eat, or what he eats; the manner of his incoming and outgoing concerns him but little. That he may be able in every action to be consonant with human life, and do the right thing at the right time and in the right way is what concerns him all the time. He would look to the spirit of the action, and, acting as spirit, whatever he did in any direction would be for the great end in view—the benefit of all beings of every grade.

In the ancient teachings of the *Upanishads* is this statement, "The work of the ascetic is neither pure nor dark, but is *peculiar to itself,* while that of other men is of three kinds." The three kinds of works alluded to in other men than the ascetic are, first, purity in action and motive; second, dark, such as those of the infernal beings; and third, mixed, those of the general run of men, which are a mixture of pure and dark.

Jesus when he walked the earth was not particular as to what he should do, what he should eat, what he should drink, nor with whom he should associate. We might say with truth that he was an ascetic, yet he never withheld himself from other men, and never desired to do so. His aim was to benefit mankind, and he touched Humanity—his fellow-men—in every possible direction, wherever it was permitted. The true ascetic must of necessity take that course. He is one who tries to get all the knowledge and all the power that he possibly can, in order that he may lay these at the feet of his fellow-men and do them service. There is nothing forbidden to him in the whole universe. With Saint Paul he will consider that now all things are lawful to him, but all things may not be expedient. He judges of the necessity of any action from the need of the case in hand, and finds that his hand is not stayed in any direction by any rules whatever, nor by any ideas that may prevail among the men of his time. Every great religious Teacher has come to break the molds of men's minds, to break the shackles of relative truth and false ideas as to man, nature and God.

We may dismiss from our minds all ideas of semi-starvation, and all ideas of becoming something ourselves. We ought to get deep in our hearts, deep into our natures, a perception of the selfishness of becoming something of ourselves, of gaining anything for ourselves. What we ought to strive to do is *the best*

we can in every direction, for the sake of all others. In so doing we become what that doing procures; we strive not to become; we strive to do—an attitude and action in which there is nothing selfish, nothing personal, but always the endeavor to use our very best knowledge and our very highest powers for the benefit of every other whom we may be able to touch.

How many of us have had other ideas? How many of us have considered that we may, by some practice or another, arrive at a stage far beyond our fellow-men? How much has that idea of stepping beyond our fellow-men weighed in our considerations in taking such steps? If it has so weighed, we have made a mistake, an error, at the very beginning, and the future must bear for us very many disappointments.

The world to each of us is what we make it. What we get out of the world is what we put into it. We cannot get anything else. The world stands to us according to the quality of our attitude towards it, according to the ideas we hold in regard to it. Do we not know that our minds are simply bundles of ideas—many of them false, many of them relative, most of them, perhaps, erroneous? We cherish them, look through them, act in accordance with them. Do we not see how needful it is that these brain minds of ours should have a true conception of man's nature, so that by thinking and acting in accord with true conceptions that brain will gradually respond to the real nature of the man himself—Man the Spiritual Being? Then he will know; he will not need anyone to tell him; he will not care what religions and practices have been, are now, or ever will be; for he will know in himself, of himself, and for himself, his own nature and the nature of every other being.

"CANAL BETWEEN TWO PLANES"

The human brain is the canal between two planes—the psycho-spiritual and the material—through which every abstract and metaphysical idea filters from the Manasic down to the lower human consciousness. Therefore, the ideas about the infinite and the absolute are not, nor can they be, within *our* brain capacities. They can be faithfully mirrored only by our Spiritual consciousness, thence to be more or less faintly projected on to the tables of our perceptions on this plane. —H.P.B.

BOUND AND FREE

FREEDOM is the common goal toward which all men aspire, though each has his own idea as to how that goal is to be attained. By some, it is thought to be through social readjustment, where each will share equally in the bounty of the world's goods. Through change of political systems and the bettering of environment, the cause of human bondage, it is thought, can be removed. But to legislate fixed conditions for people of differing ideals, of varying capacities and intelligence, only increases the bondage against which the soul revolts.

Some hold that the only sure road to Freedom is down the modern speedway of science. When inventors shall have perfected new means and devices for making life easier, they say, then only will liberation come. Yet the more *things* we have and depend upon for our well-being, the greater our enslavement to them. Dependence of the human spirit upon outward material things is again the bondage of the Soul.

What *is* the common goal or ideal of freedom? For the most, it is a constantly changing ideal, relating wholly to the personal self. Based upon current ideas of ease and comfort, it is conceived largely in terms of present enslavement. For the man in prison, Freedom means escape. But once the prisoner is released, is he satisfied long with the open air and free spaces? Does he not, in the new condition, become immediately conscious of other forms of slavery, of the binding force of poverty, or the handicaps of circumstance and environment? In whatever condition one is, he builds for himself new ideals of Freedom based upon the limitations of that condition. And these ideals attained never bring more than momentary satisfaction, for they inevitably unmask other and unending forms of limitation. Thus on we go, from goal to goal, from form to form, constantly suffering the yoke of bondage, and ever deluded in the belief that the cause of that bondage is something outside ourselves.

It is not strange, then, that while the spirit of the word "Freedom" is *detachment,* or *to be unencumbered,* it is accompanied in the minds of many with the idea of getting something—freedom *to have* this or another object of desire. Looked at from this point of view, do the men of our age really want Freedom, *i.e.*, to be unencumbered? Where is the man who is ready and willing to let go all earthly attachments, who, in the words of the *Gita,* could be "happy and content in the Self through the Self?"

So far as the personality is concerned, it is our unfulfilled desires that give us the feeling of being bound. But so far as the Soul is concerned, it is something far deeper. That which is bound is *Manas,* or the thinking Soul—bound to what is in reality but the *way and means* of winning Freedom: "*Manas* is bound by innumerable electric magnetic threads to earth by reason of the thoughts of the last life, and therefore by desire, for it was desire that caused so many thoughts and ignorance of the true nature of things."

The soul yearns to be free from the limiting conditions of matter, to resume its true universal status. But translating that yearning into ideas, we mistake the nature of the urge, and erroneously imagine it to be induced from without instead of from within. We think the feeling of bondage, or the urge to Freedom, is due to some external lack, unfulfilled desire, and consequently devote our energies to changing conditions. But even were the most ideal situation imaginable produced, and every desire fulfilled, the thirst for Freedom would continue, for it comes not from without, but from within. It comes directly from the Soul itself, and will never cease until bondage to earth-life is overcome. The purpose of life is the experience and emancipation of Soul.

The subject of the *Bhagavad Gita,* as of all sacred texts, is the freeing of the Soul from the bonds of conditioned existence. The complete life of the Soul includes planes higher than the physical, in finer bodies than the material. "There," says Robert Crosbie, "he sees and feels and hears and speaks and acts (as he does on the physical plane) but he can be here, there or elsewhere wherever his thought brings him, wherever his desire is; he can move freely and unhampered by gross physical material. . . ."

True Freedom, therefore, refers to an inner state of consciousness rather than to the experiencing of any ideal external condition. And the *state* of Freedom is attainable under *any* environment. Once attained, all outer conditions become ideal. The Soul that is free is equal-minded in every situation, neither desiring nor regretting, but using whatever conditions exist to serve mankind.

The Freedom men blindly seek *can* be realized on earth, but it must be preceded by Freedom of the Soul; clear-eyed life in the light of the Ideal which includes all beings equally. We gain glimpses of this Ideal as we aspire toward the higher life. We get foretastes of true Freedom as we strive to give others theirs, not seeking our own—whether it is of things or of rights. Thus does the Soul urge us on to the Common Goal.

STUDIES IN KARMA

The Soul's Impasse

THE appalling growth of mental disease in the United States has often been mentioned by sociologists, and dealt with in this magazine in previous years. It has been lightly scouted by the public, its politicians and publicists, until it is now attaining a growth that can no longer be ignored.

The problem has been pictured many times during the past few months, but seldom in colors more sinister than those used by Dr. Martin Gumpert, in *Redbook* for March:

> In nearly every bookstore, these troubled days, there is a well-stocked section of volumes whose very titles reflect the strains and tensions of modern living—books which tell readers how to relax, how to avoid fatigue, how to have peace of mind, how to face the problems and perplexities of life today. It is a depressing thought that there are thousands, perhaps millions, of men and women who desperately need help in resolving their overburdening emotional conflicts. . . .
>
> Our forebears had their troubles, too. Basically, there is not much difference between the mental conflicts of yesterday and of today. The "nervous breakdown" of older generations has become the "neurosis" of modern times. But it seems obvious that neurosis is much more prevalent than was nervous breakdown. What was formerly a rather rare affliction now has become a common ailment which may affect someone with whom we live or work—perhaps even ourselves.

Dr. Gumpert, after mentioning typical cases, continues:

> Look into your neighbor's face. You will find the same expression of anxiety, of fear, of bewilderment, of anger. Imagine your own state of mind reproduced by the million in your contemporaries, and you have some explanation for the chaos that ranges from hysteria over nylon stockings and white shirts and the stock market to hunger, hate and despair, to produce a condition that—from a medical point of view—can be called mass neurosis.
>
> The raw facts and figures on neurosis are indeed alarming. The general medical checkup of the nation by our Armed Forces revealed that 1,825,000 men, or thirty-nine per cent, of those rejected by the Army, were rejected for some type of mental or emotional disorder. In addition, up to July, 1945, mental causes were behind the discharge of forty-three per cent of the soldiers released from the Army for medical reasons, and other thousands were discharged because of "personality defects."
>
> Hardly a day passes without warnings from radio, newspapers, schools and pulpits about the appalling danger of a steadily grow-

ing juvenile delinquency. The rate of incidence of mental disease increases rapidly with advancing age. The old-age group of our population is steadily growing, and so are the mental disturbances of later life. The rate of first admissions to state mental hospitals has increased from 7.7 per 100,000 of the population over forty years of age in 1912, to forty-nine per 100,000 in 1936. This is a rise of more than 500 per cent. Mental disease has become this country's pre-eminent medical problem. . . .

Dr. Gumpert connects these symptoms with the deep-seated social and political unrest of our time:

The accumulation of millions of cases of individual unhappiness is responsible for most of our present international problems. Inflation, the black market, the breakdown in housing, labor strife, minority persecutions, crime waves, juvenile delinquency—these are not only political, but medical problems. They are provoked and nourished by abnormal emotional reactions of many of our neighbors—maybe of ourselves—to the sad and frightening experiences of the past years, to the lack of security, the moral uncertainties, the continuous stress and tension of everyday life.

Why did we grow neurotic? We are made of basically the same stuff as our parents and grandparents, but they were allowed to live in the serene world of the Nineteenth Century—which, of course, had its conflicts and tragedies, too. But there was far less turmoil of moral confusion; they knew or were convinced they knew what was good or bad. Their childhood and their old age were rooted in firm, time-hallowed traditions. They did not experience a change of cultural climate every few years, or continuous acceleration of time and constant shrinking of space.

We must not forget that many of us who were children in the early Twentieth Century have experienced at least five sorts of reality, as different spiritually and physically as five centuries. There was the Victorian world, the world of World War I, the intermission world, the world of World War II, and now before us is the frightening and fantastic postwar world. If we look at the circumstances which fate or history or civilization—or whatever we may call these mysterious forces—has inflicted upon us since 1914, it becomes evident that mental and emotional disbalance is the only "normal" reaction which can be expected from average human beings. Even normal animals, rats or dogs or cats, can be experimentally changed into neurotic animals when they are exposed for some length of time to frustration, anxiety and shock.

If your outlook on life, your capacity to "take" things, your energy, your tolerance, your equanimity, have deteriorated during the past years, take it as certain proof that you are a normal, basically healthy person. It is indeed normal to answer to a sequence of unpleasant and trying conflicts with neurotic symptoms. . . .

Dr. Gumpert's facts are one thing; his proposed remedies another. Before dealing with the latter, let us ask, which came first, the vulture or its egg? Gumpert sets forth the proposition that this mass tragedy is the natural reaction of normal beings to unnatural circumstances. Whence, then, came the unnatural circumstances? From God or the Devil? In that case we had best appeal to the responsible one of those personages rather than to the psychiatrist.

The complex of civilized living, however, had its rise in nothing more or less than the desires of human nature as they express themselves when subjected to certain forms of temptation. It would seem that the slightest inkling of the sequence of cause and effect would at least hint to these "authorities" that there had to be something abnormal, unnatural, or irrational about those very traits of the humanity of these times.

> We must learn [Dr. Gumpert says] that to be unhappy is rarely the fault of the victim, but is the fault of his environment; that unhappiness—in the majority of cases—is a disease the roots of which may reach back into earliest childhood.

The convenient "personal devil" again—renamed "environment." But whence the "environment?"

One must often apply to the "psychiatrist" the same rigmarole of "compulsions" and "complexes" by which he judges his brethren, in order to determine how he came to be attracted to his art in the first place—and how he arrives at his conclusions in the second!

Search for a basic cause may go far back into history, covering every state of society and every experience that man has had, from the most materially comfortable to the most vile; and it will discover merely this: that throughout recorded history man has never attained happiness, although it is the one consistent object of his incessant pursuit. The conclusion to be drawn is that the present age differs from others only in that men are losing hope in the "pursuit," and abandoning themselves to a despair which is able to find solace only in a mental evasion from this plane. This, in a nation and in a time when material desires are realized with a facility and luxuriance never before known in all this planet's history!

Here and there a modern philosopher has seen that men desire, and always have desired, the wrong things, with the necessary consequence that the height of madness, insecurity, and

disappointment is reached with the greatest fulfillment of those mistaken aims. The brighter the coin, the more dangerous its attraction.

Strangely, this has always been known by the truly great of earth—always, as long as there has been suffering among men. How long will it take the mass to learn it? As long as men listen to so-called "healers" who offer to subdue pain by pointing out gratifications of the senses, or who base their medicine itself upon the deadly heresy that man is a puppet of circumstances—the heresy that has caused the evil in the first place!

If you would be healed, seek not these sick ministers of the sick—men as unhappy and ill-adjusted as those who come to them; but seek among the hard-working simple peasants of various lands, whose lives hold little but a meagre diet, hard work, hard beds, the stars, the rain, and the sunshine! Seek among the sages of the mountains—whether of the Himalayas, the Andes, the Alps, or the Rockies—lowborn or highborn, who by one means or another come to know that man is happy, and happy only, when the crying passions, that blind him to the depths of bliss accessible within his own eternal soul, are torn up by the roots and expunged —not "suppressed"!

To these blind healers of the blind, of course, the "suppression" of desires is the worst heresy and wickedest sin of all—for they resist and deny the notion that desires can be *ended*. To them man is a mass of carnal flesh, tenuously held together by rationalized animal instinct; to them the secret of healing is an "adjustment" enabling these passions to get along with each other without tearing the man apart or causing him to tear others asunder.

But relief will never come by that road; it will never come until men understand that their *own nature* is universally misconceived by themselves.

Man is no compound of material cells organized by blind instincts; he is fundamentally a *non-material* being temporarily clothed in a form which itself is an expression only of one of the least and lowest of his creative powers. Can the ocean strive to contain itself in the drop, and be at peace? Never!

Man, a spiritual being immersed in a body of his own creation, has a double duty—to create in, and through "matter," to the end of elevating the whole evolutionary mass; but above all, to remain consciously rooted in his primeval spiritual self, eternal,

boundless in its depths, self-sufficient and self-blissful, beyond desire, beyond change, beyond sorrow.

Modern "philosophy" has circulated the most monstrous of delusions: it has blinded man, by subtle argument and sophistry, to the reality of his spiritual nature; it has debarred him in the mass from creating, by centering and monopolizing the creative power in a handful of managers and technologists, leaving their credulous followers nothing upon which to exercise their ingenuity save new justifications of vice and new flights of passionate greed.

The growing madness of America is but the misguided effort of the soul to escape these deadly bonds. It can escape, and in no long time; it can escape by merely abandoning the insane effort; or it may exit by a stupendous cataclysm brought on by the soul's necessity to end illusions that will not be broken in any other way.

Meantime it is in the power of Theosophists, and no others, to understand the nature of this imprisonment, to anticipate its end, and to be prepared to build better, even from the shards and dust of the ruins.

Man's Only Necessity

We gain infinitely more than we lose in abandoning belief in the reality of Divine Revelation. Whilst we retain, pure and unimpaired, the treasure of Christian morality, we relinquish nothing but the debasing elements added to it by human superstition. We are no longer bound to believe a theology which outrages reason and moral sense. We are freed from base anthropomorphic views of God and His government of the Universe, and from Jewish Mythology we rise to higher conceptions of an infinitely wise and beneficent Being, hidden from our finite minds, it is true, in the impenetrable glory of Divinity, but whose laws of wondrous comprehensiveness and perfection we ever perceive in operation around us. . . . The argument so often employed by theologians, that Divine revelation is necessary for man, and that certain views contained in that revelation are required for our moral consciousness, to maintain. The only thing absolutely necessary for man is is purely imaginary, and derived from the revelation which it seeks TRUTH, and to that, and that alone, must our moral consciousness adapt itself. —Quoted in *Isis Unveiled*

"THE CONTINUING REVOLUTION"

SINCE the eighteenth century the reformers and revolutionaries of the West have been exceedingly articulate on what is the "true" nature of man and what his ideal social arrangements ought to be. Ranging from Rousseau's "natural man" to the economic unit of Karl Marx, theories of human nature have been multiplying for hundreds of years, each doctrine, in proportion to its impressiveness and plausibility, producing a secondary crop of schemes for social salvation. The application of these theories is recorded in legislative history; criticism of them is to be found in a few thoughtful works, such as Spencer's *The Man versus the State,* Nock's *Our Enemy the State,* and more recently, in post-war anarchist writings. The real explanation of the relative failures of political revolution and reform, however, is clearly presented in section XII of *The Key to Theosophy.*

This general problem forms the gist of an essay by Arthur Morgan in *Antioch Notes* for Feb. 15. The author examines the extremes of social theory—rigid planning versus expedient improvisation—in an endeavor to find a workable mean between the two. An excess of planning, he points out, seems always to end in catastrophe. There is not sufficient knowledge of the complexities of human relations for men to create by law the ideal social order in all its details. Plans for social change are conceived for the purpose of curing some obvious evil; they focus on a specific wrong, failing to recognize other aspects of the common life that may be deeply disturbed by the program of reform. What Julian Huxley has called "the balance of Nature" applies in human society as in the other kingdoms, the difficulty, in this case, being the determination of what is *natural* to man.

Plato's *Republic* was an endeavor to set forth the basic analogies between man's complex nature and the necessities of social organization. This work has probably never been improved upon in principle, but it would take a genius as great as Plato himself to render the meaning of the *Republic* into the idiom of twentieth-century social thought. Despite unmistakable moral defects of the Greek civilization contemporary with Plato, there was in this period an intellectual maturity which made possible the formulation, in terms of common understanding, of an ideal social order such as the *Republic* depicts. Today, not only do we lack an equivalent maturity, but also, the problems of social organization are much greater. It is worth noting that Madame Blavatsky gave little or no attention to the *techniques* of social organization,

devoting herself entirely to the basic ethical considerations on which the good society must be founded. One may conclude that social applications of Theosophy, in terms of the structure of human relations in the mass, would have been, in H.P.B.'s time, extremely precocious—and, in all probability, far beyond the comprehension of the average person. Such comprehension is doubtless contingent upon a higher degree of moral development than the race had then attained, or has attained today, and, placing first things first, H.P.B. warned students of Theosophy that the Movement, if it is to be successful, must leave individuals free to make their own political applications of the Teaching. Theosophic applications cannot be forced, and politics involves coercion.

But while politics, considered as the manipulation of social forces, apart from basic educational impulses, is a fruitless undertaking, the understanding of the practical problems of social betterment is certainly an obligation of individual students. The social structure of the future, if it is to be the matrix of a common growth in soul, will have to correspond to the Theosophic conception of the human constitution, just as the organization of Plato's ideal community paralleled the principles of man according to Greek philosophy. There is, then, a need for thinking through the meaning of the seven principles in social terms, for searching out the implications of Theosophy in all human relations. This is to *be* a nucleus of universal brotherhood; to bear, as every germ cell bears, the memory and imagination of the ideal whole.

The present cycle, with its intensification of manasic activity, requires a more conscious and deliberate conformity to the laws of human growth than any previous civilization. Man's nature is *self-conscious* nature, so that the truly human processes of evolution cannot be fulfilled except as men rise above the instinctual and merely psychic or "traditional" level of existence. Manasic evolution takes place by *knowing,* which means the progressive understanding of the seven principles and their function in individual and social life. Until a serious beginning is made in this direction, the present race will alternate between the folly of incomplete or false theories of human progress, such as the liberal and revolutionary credos of past epochs, and the mere psychic drifting which relies upon social instinct and primitive habit. Pending that beginning, the practical recommendations of Arthur Morgan are the best possible advice for a successful policy of social change and reform. He writes:

The men who wrote our federal Constitution took some daring steps in planning the course of government. Yet the document itself, as well as the debates which accompanied its drafting, reflects their constant awareness of the inherent complexity of society, and their desire to work in accord with the human realities rather than to plot an abstract course which would diverge widely from prevailing customs. Their toleration of the un-ideal system of human slavery illustrates this attitude. By and large the American way has followed that policy of realism. It is the only course possible in a great democracy.

In contrast, social policy in continental Europe has been influenced more deeply by the academic mind with its tendency to theoretical abstraction. Karl Marx, the academic student and philosopher before he was a social revolutionary, carried his academic abstractions with him. The academic school of Pareto and Mosca gave Fascism its form. Anyone moving in German academic circles in the nineteen-twenties could see the doctrines of Nazism taking shape. All these philosophies were inherently anti-democratic. They were efforts of individuals and groups who saw themselves as supermen to conceive the perfect state and to impose it upon the undiscriminating mass.

In the modern world, drift without planning, or abstract planning without recognizing the vast complexity of society and the simplicity of our reasoning and planning abilities, are alike fatal. By the American policy of step-by-step planning and adjustment, we have eliminated human slavery as an accepted institution. We have established universal education. We have largely freed labor from cringing servitude. We have watered the deserts and brought about almost nation-wide distribution of mail and electricity. This policy is still our best for the future. Efforts to confuse, embarrass, and break down our present order with the expectation that an ideal society will follow are not the way to social well-being.

Finally, for this process of step-by-step planning to serve best we need general integrity and good will; the elements of planning as well as restraint in planning must proceed from sincere efforts for social well-being, and not be strategic moves for personal advantage.

The Federal Constitution of the United States was not a final plan for the good society, but an instrument for social evolution. Its very lack of rigidity is evidence of the wisdom of its authors, or of their intuitive genius, and while it was by no means an ethically flawless document, its provision for beneficent change gave the American social order a principle of organic growth. Like the human mind, the Constitution may be used for self-government, or turned to evil ends. No *instrument* that will work at all can be guaranteed for good use only, except by the motives of the men who use it. The basic lesson to be learned by states-

men and reformers alike is that moral intent is the paramount consideration for societies as well as for individuals. This is the teaching of all history—the conclusion of every intelligent moralist. It is contained, by implication, even in Machiavelli's *Prince*. Ferraro's instructive treatise, *The Principles of Power*, shows from a multitude of illustrations that integrity is the *sine qua non* of good government.

As Theosophy has taught in every age, there is no substitute for right motive, no technology of law, however astute, that can replace the will to do justice. The spirit of altruism, joined with a knowledge of man's nature and the necessities of cyclic law, may, however, create a scheme of social evolution that gives free play to the growth-processes of human beings. Such a scheme is embodied, in principle, in the writings of William Q. Judge, in his numerous counsels for the conduct of the Theosophical Movement. Throughout his articles and letters will be found the ideal pattern for self-government, the key to the foundation for the Golden Age of the future. It is, fundamentally, the policy of constructive adaptation to what is good in the present, under the guidance of broad principles of philosophy. Evil tendencies are not to be destroyed by violence, but by refusing to give them nourishment, until, finally, they lose their power and are forgotten. Thus, in Theosophy itself may be found the seeds of the ideal social changes of the future; and the "lines of work" of the Theosophical Movement are the means of bringing those seeds into fruition and harvest.

"The Ever-growing Light"

Nature gives up her innermost secrets and imparts *true wisdom* only to him who seeks truth for its own sake, and who craves for knowledge in order to confer benefits on others, not on his own unimportant personality. And, as it is precisely to this *personal benefit* that nearly every candidate for adeptship and magic looks, and that few are they who consent to learn at such a heavy price and so small a benefit for themselves in prospect—the really wise Occultists become with every century fewer and rarer. How many are there, indeed, who would not prefer the will-o'-the-wisp of even passing fame to the steady and ever-growing light of eternal, *divine* knowledge, if the latter has to remain, for all but oneself—a light under the bushel? —H.P.B.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS AT HOME

THE Family filed up the path to the house, Father in the lead. Mounting the front steps, he bent towards the dim entrance light and began to fumble with the keys. Following a familiar little ritual, Madge moved up next to him, and, showing her solitary key, said with a smile:

"Here, Dad, let me," and opened the door with a flourish.

"They had the right idea in the City," said Father, as he ushered Mother into the house. The Family had been to see a English picture based on J. B. Priestley's play, *They came to a City*. "That's the kind of door to have—no lock, not even a handle. It opens by itself at the right time for the right people," he added, glancing ruefully at the tangle of keys in his hand.

The Family distributed itself around the living-room, reluctant to disperse without sharing their reactions to the play.

"Yes," Chris began, "it sure would be nice to live in a place where you didn't have to lock everything." It was his job to secure the garage doors when the Family went anywhere.

"Wait until you've become a man of property, my boy," said Father, with a teasing grin. "Then maybe you'll think twice before you support the abolition of bolts and bars."

"Maybe so," Chris retorted, "only I hope I never meet the fate of Sir George and the up-and-coming businessman, Cudworth. They didn't see anything in the City at all, remember? They thought it was just a crazy scheme."

"And remember what the City thought of them?" Father chuckled. "A couple of the inhabitants asked Cudworth what his work was, and when he told them, they said, 'We don't call that work here—we call it *crime!*' And the poor little speculator didn't understand at all what they were getting at. He was simply confused."

"That's the interesting part," said Mother. "No one really *saw* the City, or appreciated what was being accomplished, except those who were ready to live there. It's like Theosophy—or anything else, for that matter—you can't possibly understand it unless you're already living it, to some degree."

"And don't forget Lady Loxfield," Madge reminded them. "She'd always been 'active in (charities,)' presumably doing all she could to ameliorate the condition of the poor. And yet, when she came to the City, she too rejected it, even though it had solved

the very problem she'd been tinkering with for years. There wasn't any need for charity in the City, because there was justice and brotherhood."

"Well, Madge," said Paul, "I think she rejected the City just because it *had* solved the problem—which meant that she wouldn't be 'Lady Bountiful' any more if she stayed there. All she was doing when she 'devoted herself' to charity work was salving her own conscience, and justifying to herself a position of wealth and power by doing a little to ease the lot of the less fortunate ones—without, however, making herself uncomfortable in the process."

"In a way," began Father, "you could say that the play was an exposure of the different kinds of possessiveness which keep men from being able to live justly with other men. There was Mr. Cudworth with his money, Lady Loxfield with her social position, and then Mrs. Stritton—she wanted to own everything she used. She wanted to 'possess' happiness, but she couldn't bear to *share* it. Mrs. Stritton hated the City, said she'd like to burn it down, just because *everyone* was happy there. And if everyone else were happy, then she couldn't be, because there would be nothing 'exclusive' about her own happiness."

"Look at Sir George—" Paul mused. "He'd always wanted to live untroubled by other people, and especially by other people's *troubles*. He would talk about their comings and goings, their sayings and doings, but he never tried to share *life* with them. He regarded his life as a precious book that he couldn't allow anyone else to read—he didn't want the pages mussed or torn."

"But the one *I* really felt for" Chris burst out, "was *Mr.* Stritton, because his wife was slowly making just another possession out of him, too. He wanted to stay in the City, and almost did, and then she broke down and cried—just like a woman," he interjected scornfully, "—and so he gave up the whole idea and came back to her. I don't think he should have," he ended, grimly, his face sombre at the thought that marriage could do *this* to a man.

"But, after all," Mother suggested, smiling at his thought, "he had responsibilities—he had chosen and promised to spend his life with her. And when he realized that besides being jealous and possessive and shrewish, she was very much afraid and needed his love and care, he knew he had to stay with her. The question is, did he go back a stronger or a weaker man? That's how we can tell whether or not the vision of Utopia had meant anything to him."

"Talking about possessiveness," remarked Paul, "do you remember the old charwoman? *Her* possession—her shopping basket—was the only thing that could be brought into the City. It was Priestley's variation on the theme that 'you can't take it with you'."

"And don't you think he was also saying that a cup has to be emptied before it can be refilled?" Father asked. "That is, in order to stay in the City, men have to give up their separative ideas and empty themselves of the personal, selfish desires which are the barriers between them and their fellow-men."

"Yes," agreed Madge. "There was one line in the play that gave the heart of it, and it was connected with that very thing. I don't remember the exact words, but in the prologue Priestley tells his companions that the City isn't a matter of steel buildings or brick buildings, this kind of floor or that kind of street—it's *an attitude of mind* which gives it its real character. I read the play before I saw the picture," she added, thoughtfully, "and I don't recall seeing that line in the book."

"You know"—Father had been enjoying a private thought—"it makes a great difference to see a picture that treats of attitudes of mind, instead of the play of emotions," he explained, permitting himself a little *play* on words.

"Well, it's a relief to come away from a show thinking about ideas, and not just feeling—whether 'picked up' or 'let down.' A picture like this one wakes you up, and that's what we need," was Paul's comment. "If we all don't think of ourselves as so many emotional balloons, it isn't because Hollywood hasn't tried to cut our moorings!"

"Yes," said Mother, "that *is* what we need—to *think*—and with a little of that it's simple to understand why some stayed in the City, and others rejected it, and why still others, while loving the City, felt they could not stay."

"Why," said Chris, with sudden insight, "they didn't need to stay. It was just the City that they had already built in their minds. They didn't want happiness for themselves, or justice for themselves, until these existed for all men."

"Of course," Father pointed out, "Priestley dosen't give us any idea about how to *attain* the attitude of mind, how to unburden ourselves of our personal baggage that keeps us from entering the City. Priestley kindles the fire, but Theosophy supplies the fuel that will keep the fire burning. It offers philosophy, which must be the foundation of any lasting City—which, indeed, will be the City itself."

PRACTICAL METAPHYSICS

VI: The Means of Evolution

WE have suggested a philosophical description of universal evolution. This has involved a definition of the individual, as both Being and Becoming. For man to realize his identity with life as a whole, to see some consistent relationship between himself and all other beings in a vast process of evolution —these are the outlines of the picture. But *how* man evolves is a matter that demands attention. Many important questions seem to have been left unanswered. The laws of evolution, the patterns of interaction established by variegated forms of life—do they contrive to make operative a law of full compensation? If evolution is self-impelled, can each receive justice at his own hands? Our view of evolution has established the monadic soul or moral self as a permanently growing entity. "Immortality" of some sort inevitably follows. Both Being and Becoming have significance for us only to the degree that they suggest permanence in man as an individual. But what kind of immortality? Do we meet old friends again, and if so where?

Such questions are, to us, important. We all manage to find some answer for ourselves on these matters. Perhaps we may find the best ones if we employ the universal perspective on Being and Becoming which our many philosophers have helped us piece together. We can be convinced of a moral law, of an ultimate justice, if we affirm the genuine existence of the moral self in man. Similarly, if the soul or self is a primary reality rather than a "condition" of the body, individuality need not be thought lost upon the death of the body. Rather would Self seem capable of informing and utilizing an infinite succession of material instruments without once losing essential character, or Individuality.

We have explored in the terms of simple, common understanding the Universality of "Spirit" and the Universality of Evolution. In an immediate and practical sense, spirit, as the "power to become," may be called the source of impulses toward a higher-than-animal life, while the conditions of evolution, the material forms which spirit and intelligence create, though themselves undergoing ultimate evolution, represent in turn the forces of "animalistic" inertia which must be managed discriminatively by the evolving being. But "evolution" has little real meaning to the individual unless he is able to believe fully in the continuity

---

Note.—This article concludes the series begun in January, 1947.—Eds.

of his own person as the *experiencer* of evolution. The question of immortality is, in importance, second to none. To say that with death there is an end to Being is to say that evolution is not a goal for the *individual* but simply a process of change during the span of a few short years. Yet a man's feelings would not naturally have it so. If "evolution" means something only to the Cosmic Process and not to man—if at any point evolution is to go on and individual man to stop—the word loses its charm. Why? Every human being, up to *and including* the moment of death, looks for "something more" to happen to him. Every man instinctively believes in the continuity of individual experience, whatever may be his intellectual professions.

And so, without apology or further circumlocution, we find ourselves at the threshold of a question which modern savants commonly consider unanswerable, the question of immortality or life after death. The assertion that our belief in such matters little affects the "realities" of life will not stand the test of simple logic. For as we think we are, so shall we be influenced to act. If the life of inner Being, which we always instinctively seek to expand, is to be terminated forever when the body fails, then we need concern ourselves only with the amassing of pleasurable sensory experience. As Thrasymachus declared to Socrates in Plato's *Republic,* with such a view of life it is more sensible to be an ignoble man who is thought to be noble than a noble man whose nobility fails to win him fame and riches. Our concept of morality has much to do with this matter of immortality, not necessarily because we will seek to avoid punishment, if there in fact be an "after-life," but because we seek the experiences of greatest enduring value only when we are convinced that there is reason for living for things of enduring value.

From the standpoint of consistency in metaphysics, the degree of moral or social responsibility which we may expect from the individual is directly equatable with his actual responsibility for himself as he now is—in other words, with his freedom to create both the determinants of his own character, the nature of his relationships with other human beings and with society as a whole. If we are to find a basis for believing that man can be wholly responsible for his actions, can create and move in a truly cooperative society, we must believe that his origin was not determined either by a fundamental predisposition to sin or by a fundamental tendency to follow the laws of purely egocentric self-preservation and self-aggrandizement at the expense of all other values. There

is only one postulate which can give us a logically consistent basis for a belief that man can transcend apparent inability to be either fully free as a creator or fully responsible for his creations. That is the postulate which represents man as a being of continuing individuality—the concept of palingenesis or continuing rebirths.

According to this theory, man's freedom and moral responsibility are alike conditioned by his own past, by choices made when *the same individual which he now essentially is,* wore the cloak of a different personality and body. Each being in his attempts to come to terms with life would thus build up inherent tendencies which in turn would influence profoundly any present or future course of action. But since *he himself* is the ultimate creator, rather than the creature of an external personal God or the product of an incomprehensible Cosmic Process, he can also be the re-maker of that same destiny. This is essentially a very old doctrine, closely allied to the Eastern concept of Karma, and according to Schopenhauer, that view of the origin and ultimate nature of the human being which "presents itself naturally to man whenever he is allowed to reflect in an unprejudiced manner." To fail to emphasize the importance of such a view is inexcusable if we are to be concerned with the capacity for full moral responsibility which *may* be "the birthright" of each individual. An excellent brief can be outlined for the "pure reasonableness" of this conception of reincarnation, but here we are principally concerned with the matter only so far as to point out that if the theory be true, we may expect far more from man as capable of maintaining a vigilant sense of individual responsibility, than we can on the basis of any other philosophy. This theory will admit sober, disciplined and unbiassed investigation—a form of attention it has not been able to receive under the dominance of Western "religious" and "scientific" dogmas.

No "conclusions" are appended to these studies, since the attempt to use correctly the inductive method of reasoning can constitute nothing more than a *prelude* to conclusions which each individual will determine for himself. The universality of Theosophical principles, of course, makes it superficially difficult to determine the difference between the language used in thinking "from the bottom up" and thinking "from the top down." This series, nonetheless, has simply brought together inferences given the sanction of logic because they are compiled from ascertainable facts of human consciousness and experience. . . . All roads, perhaps, eventually will be seen to lead in the same direction.

THE NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE

FINAL conclusions are the food of the dogmatist in religion, philosophy, or science. Yet, partial truth is the inevitable lot of probationary mankind, in accordance with cyclical law and the stage of the unfoldment of consciousness now reached in evolution. We may accept the dictum that there cannot be two truths about anything (human immortality, for instance), or, in the ultimate, two Absolute Truths about the meaning of the known and unknown Universe. At the same time, we cannot legitimately draw from this observation the comforting assurance that we ourselves, at our level, are the happy possessors of this perfect knowledge! None the less, the unending Path to Wisdom *is* there.

The main point at issue between sacred and profane knowledge is whether or not there is a higher and lower form of learning. Is there, in other words, an antithesis between the Real and the Unreal, or are they, in manifestation, but two aspects of One Absolute Principle? Is all that we can ever hope to know of anything but a mental picture which gives acceptable form to what is acquired as new information? If so, how are we to obtain access to that knowledge through which everything becomes known, and by which the "indestructible Fount of Omniscience" is attained? The nature of knowledge and its organon become increasingly important as study is put into practice in daily life. One may recall the remark of Galileo, when his contemporaries would not look through his small telescope at the four satellites of Jupiter which he had discovered: "These people believe there is no truth to seek in Nature, but only in the comparison of texts."

With the advent of Socrates and Plato, the central problem of philosophy became very largely a question of the possibility and the means of knowledge. Thales dealt a blow at the general acceptance in his day of an exact correspondence between our knowledge and the reality of the thing known. He persisted in asking: "What is it all, really?" He was followed in this process of undermining certainty, by Heraclitus who denied the permanence of objects of knowledge, and Parmenides who asserted the unreality of all that seems to our ordinary experience most real. They were precursors of Democritus, who developed the atomic theory of Leucippus, and closed the old order of thinkers and schools. Democritus differentiated the knowledge of sense from that of thought, calling the one "bastard" and the other "true-born." One of his aphorisms is: "In actual fact, we know nothing, for truth is in the depths."

He never doubted, however, the validity of his fundamental doctrine—the existence of Atoms and the Void.

It it not difficult to see that we have here, in pre-Socratic Greek philosophy, vestiges of the six *Darshanas* or Schools of Indian philosophy, the seventh School, or their synthesis, being the Occult doctrine relating to "the grand panorama of the ever periodically recurring Law—impressed upon the plastic minds of the first races endowed with Consciousness by those who reflected the same from the Universal Mind" (*S.D.* I, 269). Indeed, the key to much that is confusing for the Western mind in the extant literature of classical philosophy may be found in the Indian teachings. As an instance, the chronicle of knowledge has an unwritten chapter in the case of the idea of a law of vortical movement—"one of the oldest conceptions of Greek philosophy, whose first historical Sages were nearly all Initiates of the Mysteries" (*S.D.* I, 117). The doctrine may be traced from the Chaldean pupils of Brahmins of the esoteric school. Kapila "explains nature by the interaction of twenty four elements with *purusha* (spirit) modified by the three *gunas* (qualities), teaching the eternity of *pradhana* (primordial, homogeneous matter), or the self-transformation of nature and the eternity of the human Egos" *(Theos. Glossary)*. The exegesis of classical literature, however, is far from comprehending the true nature of the knowledge of the Initiates of old, when it assumes, with Gomperz *(The Greek Thinkers)*, that the ancient atomic theory "takes us into the heart of modern chemistry." Atomists like Epicurus (341-270 B.C.) and others, who spoke of the soul as an essence formed from the smoothest, roundest, and finest atoms, were really of the order of philosophical pantheists:

> It is not they who would have ever conceived, or dreamt that monstrous contrasted progeny, the nightmare of our modern civilized Race, namely—*inanimate* material, self-guiding atoms, on the one hand, and an extra-Cosmic God on the other (*S.D.* I, 569).

Similarly, it is an error to suppose, with scholars who reject the idea of "primordial revelation," that Anaxagoras introduced into philosophy an original and remarkable feature by his declaration that *Nous* (*i.e.* mind or spirit) was the "moving cause" which brought about the processes of nature, the mixture and separation that make up our world of infinite variety.

> That which he called Mundane intelligence . . . was called Motion, the ONE LIFE, or *Jivatma*, ages before the year 500 B.C. in India. Only the Aryan philosophers never endowed the principle, which with them is infinite, with the finite "attribute" of "thinking" (*S.D.* I, 50).

All these questions are important if we are to consider Knowledge and its instrument in the light of reincarnation and karma, as the essential components of the evolutionary process. In this sense, knowledge is to be looked upon as an activity of the mind itself. With the majority of men, the karma of mental life functions in a perplexed manner, just because the mind has not been led by education or experience to look beyond the transitoriness and contradictoriness of things to a reality which is permanent and self-consistent:

> Thy shadows [personalities] live and vanish; that which in thee shall live for ever, that which in thee *knows,* for it is knowledge, is not of fleeting life: it is the Man that was, that is, and will be, for whom the hour shall never strike. *(Voice of the Silence.)*

To this verse, H.P.B. appended a note on the word "knowledge":

> *Mind (Manas)* the thinking principle or Ego in man, is referred to "Knowledge" itself, because the human *Egos* are called *Manasaputras,* the sons of (universal) Mind.

Knowledge, then, deals with reality, and its organon is an indefeasible part of the nature of man under both its eternal and temporary aspects. Draper, in his *Intellectual Development of Europe* (ed. 1891, II, 394), recorded his opinion that the sciences—particularly anatomy, physiology, and geology—join with history in affirming that the great aim of nature is intellectual improvement. But he nowhere sees that the extension of intellectual faculties, or a law of mental development, has no real foundation unless regard be had to the structure and origin of the mind—as this science was taught in the Mystery Schools, no less than in modern Theosophy.

The modulus of *knowledge itself* is forgotten in the contemporary examination of its data. The twin shadows of Aristotle and Darwin are over-all studies of interest to the modern mind. For Plato's "Ideas," to which he ascribed all reality, and from which is borrowed what truth may be possessed by particular objects, there have been substituted the "Universals" of Aristotle, bereft of actuality and representing merely abstractions formulated by the mind in order to arrive at an empirical estimate. Instead of the Tree of Knowledge becoming in man's heart the Tree of Life Eternal, having nothing to do with man's animal senses, we have today in the field of ethics, not the inseparable connexion of knowledge and goodness, but the blind dogmatism of Darwin's teaching (*The Descent of Man*, 1871)—that the higher rules of human conduct are founded upon the social instincts. The three chapters of the work cited, in which Darwin essayed to trace

the development of moral principles in human life from the point of view of natural selection, leave unsolved the riddle of the conflict in mind and emotions, resolvable only by "the efforts of the imprisoned Manas and the Ego to liberate themselves from the thraldom of sensuous perception and see, in the light of the one eternal present Reality" (*S.D.* II, 587).

It was an axiom of the philosophical schools of the Classical Age—an echo of "Primeval Wisdom"—that the first step (and the hardest) in a veracious education is the consciousness of ignorance. Lacking this, there can be no desire to learn. Evidence of this fact is patent in the history of the Theosophical Movement and the reception given by friend and foe alike to the endeavours of the Teachers to lift—only a little—the veil hiding the face of Truth as depicted in the archaic teachings. The testimony to an ancient tradition of Knowledge was rejected out of hand, where it was not distorted to suit the prepossessions of the individual and his times. The suggestion that such terms as "Divine Thought" and "Universal Mind" have no relationship with "an intellectual process akin to that exhibited by man" in the ordinary functioning of his mind was considered, on one side, as an affront to a Personal God in his majestic attributes; and, on the other, as a heresy of the first order against the sancitity of an evolutionary law which severed man, in his entirety, from any origin save that of the protozoa. The sloka of the *Anugita Upanishad:* "I [the lower mind] am the eternal chief among all elements (i.e. senses)" (*S.D.* I, 96), besides being a clue to the dual nature of the mind, was, in fact, rather an apt description of the limits dictated by official science and theology to the lawful activity of human reason. Mind, in the way we are content to circumscribe its total functioning, may be considered as "resolvable into states of consciousness, of varying duration, intensity, complexity, etc.—all, in the ultimate, resting on sensation, which is again Maya" (*S.D.* I, 2 fn.). Thus mind was held to preclude even the possibility of the existence of a faculty of intuition, operative beyond "the tardy process of ratiocinative thought," and having its own similarity in essentials, with the absolute Wisdom "which transcends the ideas of Time and Space." And yet, if the object of the search for knowledge is to discover the meaning or indispensable nature of things, why should it be supposed that Knowledge is not a co-inheritance of mankind from remotest times, but only concurrent with Western thought, and then only possessing evidential value since the advent of what is called experimental science?

We may turn with relief from this short-sighted view of the characteristic principle of the human stage of evolution, and direct our attention to those wider and deeper aspects of "the universe of discourse" in which Giordano Bruno delighted to wander. We shall not be without exoteric company in Western lands, as Plato and those whom his thought has influenced (and still influences) in succeeding centuries bear witness. "We must get behind words," wrote Berkeley in the eighteenth century, "and consider the things themselves." Like Leibniz, he held that there is no chasm in nature, "but a chain or scale of beings." He would not confine thinking within accepted forms of communication between ourselves and others, which is all we usually know of the process. Nor was he one of those whose vision was disrupted by the appearance in the scale of evolution of man as a thinker. For him, both the subjective mind and the external world were referable to degrees of perception. He certainly would not have subscribed to the modern psychological attempt to find a genetic explanation of such a direct feeling as man's intimation of his connection with the surrounding world—such as Freud thought justified in his essay *Civilization and Its Discontents.* Here, then, as in some other quarters, we may find indications that the ancient knowledge has not been eclipsed entirely by the physical-intellectual development of Occidental man, though the battle between materialism and intuition still continues on other fields. We may go, with Swedenborg—a "natural-born magician"—to search for the Lost Word, *lux in tenebris,* among the hierophants of Tartary, China, and Thibet.

If knowledge we would have, the capacity of perception must be ours as a pre-requisite. That power we are told "exists in seven different aspects corresponding to the seven conditions of matter" (T. Subba Row, quoted in *S.D.* I, 139). The Sanskrit word for this capacity is *Pragna,* a synonym of *Mahat:* "The first principle of Universal Intelligence and Consciousness . . . the producer of *Manas* the thinking principle, and of *Ahankara,* egotism, or the feeling of 'I am I' (in the lower *Manas*)." *(Theos. Glossary.)* The esoteric doctrine of *Manas* and *Kama-Manas* combined with the Eastern metaphysical teaching of the *Nidanas* (the twelve causes of existence) is the clue to the real nature of the conflict in Man, with which psychological analysis vainly tries to deal on a basis of biological speculation. For although *Vedana,* perception by the senses, including the mind "as a product of the physical brain," is the sixth Nidana, the tenth—*Vijnana*—is "the

perfect knowledge of every perceptible thing and of all objects in their concatenation and unity." Sympathizing, in its own way, with the aim of modern psychological and therapeutic methods to increase the awareness and conscious control of the personal mental life, Theosophy could not also subscribe to the conception that consciousness is, by its very nature, limited to its concern with one small fraction of the biological and social functions of the organism. Rather, it would assert that real knowledge is not a mental but a spiritual state, implying full union between the knower and the known. It upholds the maxim of the *Books of Hermes:* "Knowledge differs much from sense; for sense is of things that surmount it, but Knowledge is the end of sense," thus emphasizing (*S.D.* I, 279) the contrast between the laboriously acquired knowledge of the senses and mind *(manas),* and the intuitive omniscience of the Spiritual divine Soul *(Buddhi).* In this transfer of knowledge to a profound basis of reality is to be found the true clairvoyance. The inner spiritual eye of the seer is defined as "the faculty of spiritual intuition, through which direct and certain knowledge is obtainable" (*S.D.* I, 46).

In this effort, continued life after life, to seek the *atma-vidya,* and to temper his system of principles and rules of investigation, regarded as an instrument of knowledge, the student will have reliance on the Good Law, as well as on *Guruparampara,* the line of succession of teachers and teaching. On this path, knowledge is not a personal wealth. It is, in essence and in fact, part of that collective Wisdom which is possessed in its purity only by the brotherhood of the *Dhyani-Buddhas*—"the eternal prototypes of the Buddhas who appear on this earth, each of whom has his particular divine prototype" (*S.D.* I, 108). This is the knowledge of eternal truths and primal causes. It is partaken of by those who have practised devotion, and who have overcome the two great enemies, *Parikalpita* and *Paratantra,* whose meanings respectively have been rendered as "error, made by those unable to realize the emptiness and illusionary nature of all; who believe something to exist which does not—*e.g.,* the Non-Ego," and "that, whatever it is, which exists only through a dependent or causal connection, and which has to disappear as soon as the cause from which it proceeds is removed—*e.g.,* the light of a wick." (*S.D.* I, 48.) The sacrifice of the personal self is the indispensable condition of attainment. "The knowledge which is now yours is only yours because your soul has become one with all pure souls and with the inmost."

HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

(From p. 212 to p. 252, Vol. I.)

By W.Q.J.

FROM p. 212 to 221 the reader can for himself find all that the author of the *Secret Doctrine* desired to give out in those pages.

WHAT ARE ELEMENTALS? In describing the groups of the Hierarchies the 6th and 7th groups are touched on at *page 221*, where it is said that elementals are a part of the numberless side groups "shot out like boughs of a tree from the first central group of the four." And they are all subject to Karma (19th line, p. 221), which they have to work out during every cycle. As it is said, lower on the page, "A Dhyan Chohan has to become" such, it must follow that even a Dhyan Chohan was once at work in the planes of being where elementals are, and from that rose up to the higher place; this must be under the laws of evolution, of Karma, of Reincarnation.

MAN'S GREAT DESTINY. Following the argument hinted at about elementals, on p. 221, it is said that the celestial Hierarchy of this Manvantara will be transferred in the next cycle of life to higher, superior worlds, in order to make room for a new hierarchy, of the same order, which will be composed of the elect ones of our own human race. Such is our destiny, and such the path up which we climb; and when that point is reached, we must work still on for the benefit of those below us. This is the basis of altruism, and without altruism the consummation cannot be reached.

THAT HIGH SPIRITS WORK ON EARTH in bodies of men, while those spirits are still in the highest spheres, see *pp. 233-234 and notes*, also *note p. 235*. On p. 233 it is clearly explained that the author does not mean that which is called among the spiritualists "control" of mediums by a spirit, but the actual continuance of the status and functions of the incarnated spirit in the supersensuous regions, while actually using as its own and working in a mortal envelope on earth. So that, according to her, there are certain persons on this earth, living and working as ordinary human beings and members of society, whose informing divine part is so immeasurably high in development that they as such high

NOTE.—This article was first printed in *The Path*, January, 1892.—Eds.

beings have a definite status and function in the "supersensuous regions." We should say—assuming the correctness of the author's statement—that she herself was such a case, and that "H.P.B.," whether hourly in the day or at night when all round was still, had a "status and function" in other spheres where she consciously carried on the work of that high station, whatever it was. There were many events in her daily life known to those who were intimate with her that this hint may ravel, or at least shed much light upon. And in one of her letters this sentence appears—in substance— "The difference between you and me is that you are not conscious except at day, while I am conscious day and night, and have much to do and to endure in both of these existences from which you, being thus half-conscious, are happily saved."

In the Hindu books and teachings there is a reference to this when they speak of high *gnanees*—that is, persons full of knowledge and spiritual power—being attracted to this earth by certain acts and at certain times in the history of nation, race, or city.

Loss of the Soul. The possibility of the abandonment of the body by the soul is outlined on *page 234* thus: "the soul could free itself from and quit the tabernacle [of the body] for various reasons—such as insanity, spiritual and physical depravity, etc." And at the end of the note on p. 235 it is hinted broadly that such freeing of the soul from the body, leaving the latter to run out its course, is not confined to the case of those who are insane or depraved, but may occur with those who make great advance in knowledge and such consequent alteration in the constitution of the soul, as it were, that they no longer can dwell on earth, using the old body. It does not appear, however, that this subject is carried any further than this hint, found, as is so usual with H.P.B., in a note. In this the words are: "For [this] occurrence is found to take place in wicked materialists *as well as in persons 'who advance in holiness and never turn back'*." From my knowledge of her methods I regard this note as a deliberate reverse of sentence, in which the object is found in the words used in the underlined part.

The Necessity for Individual Effort. This is very emphatically put, and in precisely the style of H.P.B. in the 3rd paragraph on *page 244*, in the parallelisms, where *Atma* is spoken of. Here she shows that Atma is not subject to change or improvement, but is the "ray of light eternal which shines upon and through the darkness of matter—*when the latter is willing*." (Italics are mine.) If matter, in the human being, the personal self,

the body, and the astral body, with passions and desires, is not willing to be fully informed by the Spirit, then *Atma* will not shine through it because it cannot, inasmuch as matter then does not submit itself to the Divine behests. The willingness can only be shown by individual effort toward goodness and purification. It would seem that this ought to do away with that negation and supineness indulged in even by theosophists who talk of "not interfering with Karma."

ONLY THREE DIMENSIONS OF MATTER. The "fourth dimension" is combatted on *pages 251-252 et seq.*: "So long as there are foot-rules within the resources of Kosmos, to apply to matter, so long will they be able to measure it in three ways and no more" (p. 252).

"THE ANCIENT DOCTRINE"

What we desire to prove is, that underlying every ancient popular religion was the same ancient wisdom-doctrine, one and identical, professed and practiced by the initiates of every country, who alone were aware of its existence and importance. To ascertain its origin, and the precise age in which it was matured, is now beyond human possibility. A single glance, however, is enough to assure one that it could not have attained the marvellous perfection in which we find it pictured to us in the relics of the various esoteric systems, except after a succession of ages. A philosophy so profound, a moral code so ennobling, and practical results so conclusive and so uniformly demonstrable is not the growth of a generation, or even a single epoch. Fact must have been piled upon fact, deduction upon deduction, science have begotten science, and myriads of the brightest human intellects have reflected upon the laws of nature, before this ancient doctrine had taken concrete shape. The proofs of this identity of fundamental doctrine in the old religions are found in the prevalence of a system of initiation; in the secret sacerdotal castes who had the guardianship of mystical words of power, and a public display of a phenomenal control over natural forces, indicating association with preterhuman beings. Every approach to the Mysteries of all these nations was guarded with the same jealous care, and in all, the penalty of death was inflicted upon initiates of any degree who divulged the secrets entrusted to them. —H.P.B.

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS

On Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms

APHORISM 36 (Book II): Why should a Yogi in whom veracity is complete pay the penalty of becoming a focus for "bad" works? I can understand better his being a focus for "good" works, but I should think such a Yogi would be karma-less.

It is necessary to assume that a Yogi should have counterbalanced both the cause and the effect in himself because of his complete veracity; but for others he is a representation of both philosophical truth and correct action, and is an open channel for their karma. If those who share the same environment as the Yogi are envious or resentful of him they will act in all things with partially impure motives, since recognition of a Teacher is proof that one recognizes truth in action when he sees it. "Good" karma comes to the man who understands some of the principles of wisdom, of which one of the basic, as well as most "human," is respect and gratitude for the wisdom of the teacher whose vision of truth is clearer than one's own. Unless the relationship between any individual and the Yogi is a proper one, the karma of that individual will be "mixed" rather than good, and thus the Yogi will feel those mixed effects, while he enjoys the fruits of his own right thought and action. He is also a key to the right thought and action of others. He is, in fact, the "key man" in society, as was Plato's philosopher-king, and, unless his place be recognized, society (or karma) will withhold certain benefits (or good karma) which would otherwise accrue. Without any conscious effort to be such, the Yogi is an open sesame for the good karma of others. He is the truth before men which they must be able to identify if they are to have the complete wisdom which brings right action and "good karma."

The same principle would apply to what is called "bad" karma—for the usual classes of "bad karma" would simply be the results of denying truth. Yet another principle is also involved in the matter of a good and great man being the focus for karma resulting from "bad works"—a principle known as "the economy of nature." Just as poisonous mushrooms seek the shade of a great oak, since otherwise the conditions necessary for their growth do not exist, so also do many dire and troublesome events focus around the yogi, for the reason that only he has sufficient wisdom to deal with them. The breadth of his knowledge can make room

for human confusion or malignance in others, since his nature will not be inwardly troubled by anything that befalls. In this way, perhaps, can many "bad things" come to the great and wise.

Aphorism 37: "When abstinence from theft, in mind and act, is complete in the Yogee, he has the power to obtain all material wealth." Would this mean that such an one as described above could, if he chose, become very wealthy in this commercial civilization of today? If honesty is thus seen to be such an important factor in the acquirement of material wealth, why it is that such a large percentage of relatively dishonest men are so materially wealthy, and conversely, why do many honest men barely manage to acquire enough wealth to support their families?

The average "honest man" is not a yogi, as the latter term is used by Patanjali. "The Yogee of time's duration" has more than one kind of wisdom, honesty being for him simply the inconspicuous by-product of knowledge of all things in their proper relation one to another. The Yogi has a highly developed manasic faculty —manas lighted brilliantly by fusion with the inspiration of Buddhi. Such a man can acquire any "material wealth" that is *really needed* by applying his crystal-clear mind to the problem presented, or he can inspire such trust in others that they will without question place all wealth under his stewardship. The latter, in fact, would be the most natural working out of karma in our age, since the direct acquisition of wealth in the commercial world would be something of a waste of time for a great spiritual teacher. For the average honest man, however, there are still many obstacles to be overcome. As the potentialities of his mind develop he may find it increasingly difficult to be honest—just as the awakening faculties of man after the first rounds and races tend to confuse him and suggest through vivid imagination the "beauties" of the road of exploitation. In a practical sense, men do not shower trust upon the honest man unless he is also provenly a wise and practical man, for honesty in itself does not insure that the *best* use will be made of property or wealth entrusted to his care.

Aphorism 38: Why should "continence" be so important, when it applies only to the body—the ephemeral?

The place of occurrence of this reference to continence suggests that more is meant to be conveyed by the word than simply physical chastity. The qualities discussed as unworthy in pre-

vious aphorisms are enmity, theft, anger, questionable things, etc. Aphorism 39 speaks of "covetousness" in exactly the same way. Continence, in this context, becomes *the ability to restrain all forms of self-indulgence or sensualism.* It is the *tendency* to self-indulgence which takes strength from the body and from the mind. Sensual self-indulgence is first a mental misuse of the energies of the body—instead of raising the level of expression for the body-lives, the soul infuses itself into a "stretching" of the normal capacities for psychic feeling and thus exploits and damages a normal capacity. The effects of this are both bodily and mental, as the decline of Grecian civilization in particular attests.

Aphorism 42: If it is possible for a Yogi to acquire superlative felicity, how are we to understand Aphorism 15, of this Book, which says that to the man who has attained the perfection of spiritual cultivation, "all mundane things are alike vexatious."

Mundane things *as* mundane things would clearly be "vexatious" to the knower of spiritual reality. Yet in all things and events the Sage, it is said, can see the spiritual *in* the physical—beyond and above it, no matter how superficially interwoven the two may be. Aphorism 15 also posits that mundane things are vexatious *until* the "highest condition" is reached. Beyond that point nothing is vexatious, and when nothing is longer vexatious one is in a state of superlative felicity. When one fears no failure, dreads no disappointment, he can begin to truly live with vitality and full awareness on all planes.

"The Harmony of the Spheres"

In parentless and eternal space is the wheel in the center where the Lipika are, of whom I cannot speak; at the four angles are the Dhyan Chohans, and doing their will among men on this earth are the Adepts—the Mahatmas. The harmony of the spheres is the voice of the Law, and that voice is obeyed alike by the Dhyan Chohan and the Mahatma—on their part with willingness, because they are the law; on the part of men and creatures because they are bound by the adamantine chains of the law which they do not understand. Because of the mysterious nature and incomprehensible powers of the Lipika, it is not possible to know enough to say anything with either sense or certainty. But of the Dhyan Chohans and the Adepts we may know something, and are often given, as it were, tangible proof of their existence. —W.Q.J.

ON THE LOOKOUT

Civilization and Culture

That something is wrong with modern civilization is obvious. So far from being a reclamation from barbarism by a process of social development, we are witnessing an unintelligible idiom, characteristic of the confusion that marks all phases of human activity in East and West. Looking at the disparate world today, there are but few signs of the intellectual and moral discipline which is the hall-mark of any genuine culture. Indeed, it would be truer to say that most civilized achievement approximates to the form of culture known to microscopy: a set of organisms produced by artificial development. Discussing modern Universities, James Eastwood says (*World Review* for February): "There is at present no intellectual centre from which there is the promise of a new synthesis." There may be such a centre of which Mr. Eastwood knows nothing; but, in the work-a-day world, how can we expect to find one, so long as the philosophical basis of such a synthesis is rejected and disparaged out-of-hand? The history of Theosophy, as Divine Knowledge or Science, from the third century of our era, and with special reference to contemporary thought, is witness to the truth that selfishness and ignorance are still the twin foes to the reconciliation of "all religions, sects and nations, under a common system of ethics, based on eternal verities."

A World Perplexed

Quoting Ortega y Gasset's conception of culture as neither a superficial gloss nor an escape, but as offering a view which "saves human life from being a mere disaster" (*Mission of the University,* Princeton Univ. Press), Mr. Eastwood continues:

> Now it is precisely culture in this sense (as the repertory of convictions by which men *live*) that Europe today so conspicuously lacks, and this is one of the deeper causes of the crumblings away and upheavals that the last two generations, especially, have witnessed. It is a general spiritual disintegration, a sort of mass schizophrenia.

This psychic "climate," however, is not confined to one Continent. Its phenomena are universal, and call for universal study. We know that conventional religion is bewildered by its own institutional life and its unsuccessful efforts to transform the lineaments of tribal and priestly deities into the polite features

of "civilized" men. The Churches would appear to have no serviceable message for the emotional life of mankind. But even the tireless endeavours of Science through the years—since Charles Darwin published his *Origin of Species* in 1859—have not finally established the special theory of the development of the organic world through the struggle for existence and its necessary outcome, Natural Selection. Without guidance from either religion or science, disintegration naturally follows.

The Pursuit of Knowledge

The scientific theory that man is an animal which forms organized societies precludes the acceptance of mental and emotional changes based upon cyclic law. Without such recognition, no key to human evolution is discoverable, and scientists will grope in the intellectual darkness described by Dr. Ellsworth Huntington in his impressive study *Mainsprings of Civilization,* where he observes that "no one really understands why human tools, in the broader sense, have advanced from simple flints to elaborate ocean liners, and why the social unit has expanded from the family to the International Labor Office." There is a touch of bitter regret in this truthful admission. It is unlikely, however, that the modern generation of scientists will ever subscribe to the exact opposite of the conventional theory of evolution—hinted at in these words of Proclus: "All things are full of divine natures . . . while every order of things proceeds gradually in a beautiful descent from the highest to the lowest." (Quoted in *Isis,* I, 244.)

The Case of the Frightened Scientist

Apart from the already expressed doubt as to whether scientists are human, there is public admission of their growing release from comforting deceptions. Writing in the *World Review* (February), Mr. Peter Fletcher suggests that the malaise from which we are suffering—

> is the state of emotional confusion that makes it possible for us to become more and more civilized, and more and more afraid at the same time: afraid, that is to say, where no danger lurks; afraid, not of the physical hazards of earthly existence, but of ourselves and each other; so that the greater part of our energy is consumed in self-protective activities that make us solitary, competitive, ambitious, learning-conscious, class-conscious, or prowess-conscious. . . . This confusion of mind is the secret of the power of Science over us, and it explains the scientists' present disillusionment.

This is well said, as is also the further comment:

> Our faith in Science, and the faith of the scientists themselves in its power to yield spiritual and moral truth as well as factual knowledge, is merely an aspect of this basic ignorance and confusion of mind. That is why the spectacle of the scientists' disillusionment is so shocking for mankind. It is a public confession of the final failure of practical reason to apprehend personal reality. It reveals the limitation of the scientific consciousness: its inability to perceive that knowledge is merely power, and that power has no moral significance whatever.

NEUROSIS OF CIVILIZATION

The etiological factors in the neurosis of our civilization are variants of *avidya* ("the ignorance which proceeds from and is produced by the illusion of the Senses"), and *Attavada* ("the heresy of the belief in Soul, or, rather, in the separateness of Soul or *Self* from the One Universal Infinite Self"). Mr. Fletcher has glimpsed a facet of this diagnosis. He writes:

> There is overwhelming evidence in our behaviour of this confusion. . . . It is the *leit motif* of every neurosis, and of every psychological theory based on the assumption that a self can be a self in isolation.

Scientists in most fields of experimentation have identified themselves with their researches to such an extent that synthesis eludes them, if, indeed, they can be brought to admit the existence or need of a union of elements in any inquiry. So far has this analytical process gone that there is a perceptible disintegration of the personal consciousness. Even if he would like to think of himself as such, the man of science is no longer a *Magus*. In his concentration upon physical phenomena in a specialized field, he has lost the spiritual sense of unity which could link him with universal processes or with his predecessors of ancient days. For the basis of that true Magic which gives control over nature's forces has been defined as follows:

> A thorough familiarity with the occult faculties of everything existing in nature, visible as well as invisible; their mutual relations, attractions, and repulsions; the cause of these, traced to the *spiritual* principle which pervades and animates all things; the ability to furnish the best conditions for this principle to manifest itself, in other words, a profound and exhaustive knowledge of natural law.

What hope is there of Science getting rid of its monomania (shared with Western civilization generally) on the subject of its material achievements?

The Muse of History

There must be a return to First Principles, and recognition of a spiritual and intellectual pedigree that antedates both the Classical Age and the Christian era. The denial that any one political or moral theory can justly claim universal acceptance must be met by reference to a doctrine which is the essence and original element of all the religions and philosophies now known to the world. We must embrace the advice given by Sir Thomas Browne, who wrote, in 1658, in his *Religio Medici:* "'Tis opportune to look back upon old times and contemplate our forefathers. Great examples grow thin and are to be fetched from the past world. Simplicity flies away, and Iniquity comes at long strides among us." So persuaded, we may be led to see the force of the question asked by H. P. Blavatsky: "If modern masters are so much in advance of the old ones, why do they not restore to us the lost arts of our postdiluvian forefathers?" We may also subscribe to what an anonymous writer in the London *Times Literary Supplement* (Aug. 17, 1946) suggested as being the greatest gift of Clio:

> . . . an intimate personal enlightenment. The frontiers of time are as enticing as those of space, and to be vitally aware that the past, the present and the future form a trinity in which there are no priorities and no divisions is to be highly privileged. Such realization, if it be permanently won, will impart a special quality to every judgment, and lend a special savour to each perception.

History and Human Mind

"He who would deal with motives," wrote the eminent historian, Edward Maslin Hulme, in *History and its Neighbours*, "must remember that human nature is elusive, erratic, volatile and protean." So it is when the mind is made captive by the shadow of the personality. Before civilized man will be able to overcome his cultural neurosis, he must learn to cleanse his mind-body, and increasingly to identify himself with the Higher Manas or Ego whose faculties correspond to *Vijnana,* "the perfect knowledge of every perceptible thing and of all objects in their concatenation and unity." For, what is human mind in its higher aspect, whence comes it? Esoteric philosophy supplies the answer:

> In its very essence it is THOUGHT, and is, therefore, called in its plurality *Manasa putra*, "the Sons of the (Universal) mind." This individualized "Thought" is what we Theosophists call the *real* human Ego, the thinking Entity imprisoned in a case of Flesh and bones. This is surely a Spiritual Entity, not *Matter*, and such Entities are the incarnating Egos that inform the bundle of animal matter called mankind, and whose names are *Manasa*. . . .

In the duality of these *Manasa,* or "Minds," once incarnated, and in the non-recognition of the fact by a suffering mankind, is to be found the diagnosis of the world's malaise in this cycle.

MAGAZINES OF REVOLT

Lookout for March took note of the literature of protest, both social and artistic, contained in the numerous independently published periodicals called the "little magazines." As pointed out by the authors of a recent history of these expressions, most of the little magazines were born in the 1920's, embodying the revulsion of writers and artists from the crass atmosphere and commercial spirit of the period immediately following the first world war. The second great war of the twentieth century has been productive of similar reactions, although the little magazines of this generation have characteristic themes which were absent in the earlier crop. For example, the political orientation of "liberated" thinkers in the 1920's steadily converged to the radical socialist or communist viewpoint, whereas today, the movement is in a quite different direction—toward philosophic or pacifist anarchism. At least three periodicals established during the war have developed this view—Dwight Macdonald's *Politics,* Holley Cantine's *Retort,* and *Why,* an anarchist bulletin published in New York.

WHAT ONE MAN CAN DO

The columns of *Why* frequently take note of independent moral action on the part of individuals, illustrating the capacity of a single man to stand on principle against autocratic or majority pressure. *Why* for March reports the "disgrace" of the eminent physicist, Peter Kapitza, in his homeland of Soviet Russia, because of his refusal to work on the problems of nuclear fission. Kapitza, who gained fame in England for research on liquefying gases, was forced to remain in Russia some 12 years ago, when he returned home from England for a visit. The Soviets finally rewarded his services (see Lookout, XXVII, 278); and he became the only director of the Institute of Physical Sciences. *Why* translates from the French journal, *Le Libertaire:*

> "But after Hiroshima, Stalin and the Departments of National Defense and the Interior appealed to him to orient his research toward atomic disintegration, to determine the process for the manufacture of the atomic bomb. Kapitza refused and continued his work on gases and low temperatures.

"Since last October he has not appeared at the Institute and all that the Government will admit is that 'he has been advised not to appear in public'."

Why comments:

Of course the exact reasons for Kapitza's refusal are not known. It may be due to an honest objection to war, or because of his English friendships, or simply because he got more pleasure from continuing his own work. Whatever the reason, Kapitza's example should be pondered by all those who are following along on the march to death. Refusal to fight or work on any war implements is the only practicable step we can take now. If the governments of the world won't disarm, we must.

"The Real Issue"

Another of the war-born little magazines, called *Pacifica Views* —one which recently passed out of existence—was begun on the Pacific Coast and later moved to Chicago. The Feb. 24 issue of this weekly contained a discussion of "Integrity—the Real Issue," which illustrates the temper of some of the younger writers of the war generation. The problem under consideration is the individual's responsibility in wartime. The author, Frank Triest, starts from first principles:

Personal integrity requires that one select voluntarily his course of life and assume personal responsibility for the consequences. Accordingly a scrupulous person will not, for instance, join a secret order that pledges him to a future course of conduct the particulars of which he is not told in advance. He refuses to hand over his personal moral judgment to anyone else. . . . The major casualties of war are not the dead and wounded, but those who have acquiesced in an arrangement by which someone else makes their moral decisions for them. This predicament can not be eliminated without scrapping the war system; for warfare can not be carried on without depriving the personnel of the right to follow their own conscience step by step in the day to day proceedings of the conflict. Neither is rejection of war an abandonment of man to injustice and ruin—unless we ourselves are of such nature that we would so treat the human race!

A Beginning Must Be Made

That is to say, there is no basic moral difference between races and nations, and there is no start toward world solutions till people admit that their own nation differs from others in very

> little save in resources and opportunities. Once this is admitted, it follows that if we would like to have a peaceful world, others would also; and that if Americans in general would welcome such a world, so would Russians and Germans, Chinese and Hottentots. . . .
>
> As long, however, as all sense of responsibility can be lost in the anonymity of numbers and the impersonality of institutions, no powerful nation will bother to do the simple thing that is necessary to set the ball rolling. If hardly anyone feels any responsibility for war or for the social iniquities that produce it, it is most unlikely that anything effective can be done for world peace.

And so, Mr. Triest comes back to Integrity—"the real issue." He has indeed touched upon the essential problem of the age, the problem of personal moral responsibility, in relation to all things as much as in relation to war. The question of *individual* duty is the key to overcoming authoritarianism in all its forms, whether religious, military or political. It is also the key to the present cycle of human evolution. But whether the writers of the little magazines will be able to follow up this discovery with its clear implication—that of the spiritual nature of man—and dare to pursue further the metaphysical conceptions thus suggested, is another question. These steps are necessary ones, if the youthful thinkers of the war generation are to pass from their moral individualism to a sense of the larger moral *order* involved in true social evolution. The little magazines, however, have made a beginning in the right direction. Non-sectarian metaphysics, for some at least, may not be far away.

Drive For Military Training

Since President Truman's "State of the Union" message, delivered to Congress on Jan. 6, in which he requested a law to provide for universal military training of the youth of the nation, the various organizations and pressure groups desiring peacetime conscription have been working day and night to persuade reluctant legislators of the necessity for this measure. The President is himself an enthusiastic supporter of the program, having on Dec. 19, appointed a strongly pro-conscription commission to investigate and submit recommendations concerning a system of military training. The war Department itself, which in February organized its own commission to supplement the activities of the Presidential commission, has suggested that compulsory military training be integrated with college education, and would install on each campus a military unit staffed by high ranking army

officers, the latter becoming regular faculty members of all colleges and universities. The threat to academic freedom in this phase of the program is fairly obvious.

"Fear Campaign"

Analysis of news reports shows that proponents of universal military training have long used to the full the uneasiness of the American people to gain support for a conscription law. Writing in Berlin early last year, C. L. Sulzberger reported the feeling of European diplomats that the United States War and State Departments had deliberately encouraged fear of Russia in order to justify their policies. "Observers," he said, "believe a campaign was worked up to attain a better psychological balance of public opinion to permit the Government to adopt a 'harder line'." (New York *Times,* March 22, 1946.) Today, military spokesmen who urge the adoption of peacetime conscription take similar advantage of the unsettled international situation, special drives for a military training law seeming to be timed to coincide with the release of gloomy and threatening news from abroad.

Preparedness — For War Or Peace?

The position of the man in the street with regard to these matters is one of almost complete helplessness. The information he needs to make up his mind for himself is virtually inaccessible without special research, and the political atmosphere is filled with gales of propaganda and menacing thunderheads of international recrimination. The few individuals who try to get unbiassed facts before the public are usually attacked as "pacifists" or "isolationists," regardless of their true motives or intentions. The only real recourse, therefore, for the average citizen, is to formulate the issues of the day to himself, in terms of broad general principles, and choose accordingly. Dr. Evan W. Thomas, a New York physician (previously quoted in Lookout, July, 1942), in a statement before the President's Advisory Commission on Universal Training on April 5, provided one such analysis:

> . . . it seems to me that the experience of the past thirty years indicates that conscripted service which requires the full time of the conscripted individuals has neither preserved nor advanced the liberties sought by our forefathers. In our present civilization, the methods demanded by conscripted military service can only restrict freedom and must ultimately lead to the tyranny of the state. Totalitarianism such as now exists in Russia thrives on violence and authoritarianism. Democracy does not. This in itself

is sufficent reason for the democracies of the world to exert every pressure for the universal abolition of conscription and for disarmament. Such an appeal, if persevered in, would in time have its effect on the peoples now under the control of the Russian government. It would, in my opinion, do more to alter the present totalitarian character of communism than any other one thing. On the other hand, the adoption of conscription by democratic countries will have the opposite effect of that desired on the Russian people, who will reject as hypocritical any moral appeal coming from the democracies.

Liberty, as understood in America, rests on moral values and the character of the individual citizens. Freedom demands individual responsibility and honesty. These values can be inculcated by education and example which comprise the mores of a particular society. They are not created by conscription. In spite of the discipline demanded by enforced training, there is no evidence that conscription enhances the moral fiber of citizens. Rather, the reverse is true.

Service to one's country is a laudable purpose, but one or more years of enforced training cannot create that purpose in the hearts and minds of individuals. Such compulsion is actually an admission of moral defeat and a reflection on the moral training and character of the American people. It creates a dependence on the authority of the state which in turn creates a demand by individuals for support by the state. It discourages individual initiative and responsibility.

COLLECTIVE KARMA

The moral and social confusion of the present day is due largely to the neglect of principles such as these. Amidst the clamor of competitive ideologies, a majority of the people have submitted to the specious doctrine that in political and international affairs, the moral basis of human relations must be ignored in order to "get things done" in a "practical way." We imagine that somehow, the ideals we claim as individuals can survive repeated violation so long as we always violate them *collectively*—distributing responsibility for corporate acts and general policies throughout the mass, forgetting that collective action is only the moral sum of individual choice. Dr. Thomas' statement is measured, without rhetorical flourishes. It is a statement of *law,* so far as the health of the democratic community is concerned. Students of Theosophy are often asked to explain the meaning of "national Karma." These several paragraphs on conscription in a democratic society treat of the processes of national Karma, how they work and where they lead.